

Crapsey, A.S.  
International  
republicanism...

940

92

C858



940.92  
C858

GIFT OF  
Society

# INTERNATIONAL REPUBLICANISM

*The Way to Permanent  
Peace*

By

ALGERNON SIDNEY CRAPSEY

AUTHOR OF

ELIGION AND POLITICS, THE RISE OF THE WORKING CLASS, ETC.



SOCIETY FOR ETHICAL CULTURE

1324 SPRUCE STREET

PHILADELPHIA

1918

UNIVERSITY OF PENNSYLVANIA LIBRARY

COPYRIGHT  
ALGERNON SIDNEY CRAPSEY  
1918

Prices of Pamphlet

|   |              |
|---|--------------|
| Single copy . . . . .                     | Ten cents    |
| Single copy Postpaid . . . . .            | Twelve cents |
| Ten copies, Parcel Post . . . . .         | One dollar   |
| One hundred copies, Parcel Post . . . . . | Nine dollars |



U.S. - Hist. -  
Internationalism  
-  
U.S. - Hist. -  
date

B. C.

940.92

C858

THE substance of this Treatise on World Organization was delivered as an Address in the Broad Street Theatre in the City of Philadelphia on Sunday morning, January 20 of the current year, before The Society for Ethical Culture of that City.

The Director of that Society, at the instance of various members, has asked that the Address be reduced to writing and be given the Society for publication. I gladly comply with this request under the conviction that World Organization should at this time receive full, free discussion. This matter must be decided in the end by the Public Opinion of the World and any well-digested contribution to that opinion should have public expression.

431652

48.30-18 4-30



# International Republicanism

## THE WAY TO PERMANENT PEACE

---

### **The Political Ineptitude of the American Aborigines**

WHEN the Pilgrim fathers, leaving the Mayflower, stepped from Plymouth rock to the shore of that country where they were to lay foundations for a new civilization, though they did not know it, there was before them a stretch of land extending westward more than three thousand miles and to the northward and southward more than ten thousand miles. This vast continent containing, as it did, more than one-fifth of the landed area of the globe, was rich in all material necessary for the maintenance, comfort and happiness of human life. The fertility of its soil was manifest in the extent and variety of its vegetation; its rivers were vast sources of mechanical power; inexhaustible beds of coal lay under its ground and its mountains were veined with iron, lead, copper, gold and silver. What the Pilgrims and other Europeans found when they discovered and settled the Western Continent was not simply a land but a store-house, wherein were the hidden treasures of the ages.

And this land was to all intents and purposes uninhabited; its soil was virgin; its forests primeval. There were no cities on the shores of its seas and no highways running through its country-sides; the deer ran wild in its hills and herds of buffalo ranged over its plains.

And yet this continent from time immemorial had been the home of man. When the white man came to make his settlements he found the red man in possession. This race of men, so absurdly called Indians, had emerged from savagery and were in the middle stage of barbarism; they cultivated the soil and were skilful in the arts of weaving and pottery. The men were tall and well built, fearless and temperate; there were no drunkards among them for they had not mastered the processes of fermentation and distillation. They did not know the curse of poverty which afflicts the higher forms of social organization, for they had all things in common. These people were inspired with the poetic spirit of the forest and had evolved a spoken language as musical as the sound of their running waters; their chiefs held sway not more by their bravery in war than by their eloquence at the council fires.

And the wonder is why a race of men so gifted and so promising had not long before the coming of the white man made this land their own; why by natural increase they had not so populated the land as to make the intrusion of the stranger impossible? As it was there were only a few thousand men, women and children wandering over a region which is now the home of more than a hundred million people.

The explanation of this historical enigma lies in a knowledge of the fact that this race of men had never been able to evolve politically out of the consanguinous tribe into the higher forms of the state and nation. Each of these consanguinous tribes were autonomous and sovereign. Fighting for its own hand each tribe was the natural enemy of every other. This political ineptitude made a condition of war between the tribes continuous. War and the chase, which is a species of war, were the only occupation of the males. Every Indian was a brave; his insignia his war paint. He waited eagerly for the snows of winter to melt, not that he might go forth and



sow his seed against the time of harvest, but that he might go forth on foray to return, if triumphant, with his string of scalps, to receive the caresses of women and the praises of old men. This constant slaughter of the males in their prime made anything like a natural increase of population impossible. And more than this the tribes, in their intense tribal hostility, waged wars of extermination; women and children as well as men falling before the arrow and under the tomahawk.

---

## II

### **Restriction of the Area of War by the State**

THIS race of warriors, because they were only warriors, fell easily and speedily before the oncoming of a race which had been engaged for ages in the process of restricting the area of war and enlarging the

area of peace. What we call civilization is nothing else than the outcome of this restriction and enlargement. It can readily be seen that if war, which is killing, has no restriction, then progress in science and art and letters is impossible; all the energies of men are spent in this business of killing and being killed; the budding genius is destroyed in the blossom and there is no ripening of the fruit of thought and emotion.

Even the American Indian had seen the necessity of restricting the area of war. There could be no war between tribesman and tribesman; for a tribesman to kill a tribesman was not war, it was murder; and murder was, from the beginning, a foul and loathsome crime, bringing upon its perpetrator not only the vengeance of the living, but of the dead, who from their graves reached out avenging hands to destroy such destroyers of tribal integrity.

This distinction between killing and killing, between the killing of kin and the killing of the stranger, has become an integral principle of morality. To kill kin is a deed of shame; its penalty the black cap and the gallows, the strap and the electric chair; to kill the stranger, the man of another tribe or nation, is an act of glory; its reward the golden cross, the plaudits of men and the smiles of women.

Every step in social progress has emphasized this distinction in the matter of killing. When the Aryan race evolved from the tribal into the family organization, then killing within the family was not only a crime, it was sacrilege; it was an offence against the household gods and the nearer the kin the greater the crime. The patricide, the matricide, the fratricide, could never escape the wrath of these divinities. No matter what the provocation the deed was unpardonable. This moral principle is illustrated by the case of Orestes. Orestes avenged the murder of his father by killing Clytemnestra his adulterous mother. But the crime of the mother did not excuse the crime of the son. Byron in the IV Canto of "Childe Harold" writes thus of Orestes:

"O! thou who never yet of human wrong  
Left the unbalanced scale, great Nemesis:  
Thou who didst call the Furies from the abyss,  
And round Orestes bade them howl and hiss  
For that unnatural retribution—Just,  
Had it been from hands less near."

So instinct is this principle of the sanctity of life within the family that its violation under any circumstances, no matter how provoking and appalling, excites emotions of horror in the looker on. A violation of this principle is evidence of a high degree of mental and moral depravity. It is this principle that has been the conservator of human life and the potent cause of human progress. When a

man locks his doors at night, he locks out his foes and locks in his friends and he can lay him down in peace and take his rest; the family roof and the family love are his safety.

When the family evolved into the State, then this principle was extended to cover the citizenship of the State. Killing within the State is a crime against the peace of the State, which the State punishes with the death or long imprisonment of the killer. In a well-ordered State no man may avenge his own wrongs, no matter how provoked he must withhold his hand. Vengeance is mine saith the State.

It is this which has made the area of each organized State an area of peace. In any well-ordered State wars between citizens are forbidden; when such wars begin the State is in dissolution. It is the prime duty of the State to keep the peace. When a State cannot keep the peace it ceases to be a State.

This restriction of the area of war and extension of the area of peace within the State has become as the air we breathe; so constant an environment that we have ceased to be conscious of it. We move to and fro, unarmed and unafraid, over a vast territory in the midst of millions of people and suffer no harm. It is true that within all States murders do occur, but they are so few in proportion to population that they are negligible in calculating the chances of life.

It was because the European had evolved the family and the State as protections for his peace that he increased in numbers, progressed in sciences and arts and so had an immense advantage over the aboriginal American. In comparison with the red man, the white man was distinctly a man of peace and as a man of peace he was stronger than this man of war.

### III.

#### **War Between State and State Necessary and Continuous**

IT MAY seem ironic to call the European a man of peace, and we so call him only by comparison. War in Europe between the States has been as continuous as war in America between the tribes. The only reason that the European can be called more peaceful than the aboriginal American lies in the fact that the State as a political unit, restricting the area of war and enlarging the area of peace, is a larger unit than the unit of the tribe.

Since the organization of the State each State has been autonomous and sovereign; like the tribe it plays its lone hand and by force of this circumstance is the enemy of every other State. Even until now this fact is the recognized basis of the State's existence. If it is to endure, a State must be ready to defend itself against aggression from other States. Small States exist only on sufferance. At any moment they may like Poland and Belgium be blotted from the map. For this reason every State maintains a department of war, with its standing army and navy. It watches with jealous eye the action of neighboring States and runs a race with them in the matter of armament. The whole life of the State is occupied by war or preparation for war.

And this has been the history of the European State from the beginning. Tribes have not been more hostile to tribes than States have been to States. In civilized States war, which has for its purpose the destruction of the property and life of neighboring States, has been reduced to a science, practiced as an art and engaged in as a business. And at any moment a State may inflict this calamity upon its neighbors. Today Belgium may be busy at work, by its industry helping to feed and clothe the world; tomorrow Belgium may be over-run



by a German army, its beautiful cities destroyed, its fruitful fields trampled into mire, its men shot down as they stand against the walls of its churches, and its women forced to satisfy the lust of the invader. What has happened to Belgium has happened over and over again in the history of Europe and will continue to happen as long as the present autonomy and sovereignty of the State endure. The present political organization of the world holds the peace of the world subject to the action of any State in the world.

In its devastating, destructive power modern warfare makes the warfare of former times seem as if the men of old were children playing at war. And this terrific character of modern warfare is owing to the increased power of the individual State, consequent upon the increased area of peace maintained by the larger political units. The immense armies of modern war are drawn from the equally immense populations which the peace of the State has made possible. The deadly paraphernalia of modern warfare, the submarine, the aeroplane, the asphyxiating gas, are products not of war but of peace. These improvements in the methods of warfare are not made by warriors on the battlefield, but by students in the laboratory and if war so extends its area as to compel such works of peace to cease, if it drives the farmer from his field, the workman from his factory, the student from his study, or if it shall draw these from their peaceful occupations to replenish its armies, then war itself must perish from inanition. Beaten, starved nations will be compelled to make a peace and keep the peace. Again and again in the history of Europe wars have ceased only when the ravages of war have put an end to all works of peace. Where there is no more peace there can be no more war.

#### IV.

##### **Extension of the Area of Peace by Conquest**

It is this law of decreasing peaceful area in direct ratio to the increasing area of war that has made the conquest of one State by another necessary in the present stage of political evolution. As long as each State is autonomous and sovereign, so long must wars between the States be continuous; conflicting interests under such conditions can be harmonized only by clash of arms; each State being sole judge in its own quarrel must submit that quarrel to the ordeal of battle. The only way neighboring States can put an end to such intolerable conditions is by the conquest of the weaker State by the stronger. If there is to be any peace at all in a world of discordant States it must be the peace of might; the weaker elements must be brought into subjection to the stronger. And such has been the course of history; the area of war has been restricted, the area of peace enlarged by process of conquest.

Civilization began to flourish in the East when Nineveh or Babylon made peace possible by the subjection of the hill tribes to these cities of the plains. Thebes and Memphis in Egypt were seats of learning because the power of the Pharaoh was strong enough to subdue the Arab of the desert. But the best example of peace by conquest is seen in the Roman domination. The Romans, we are told by Goldwin Smith, became a conquering people not because they were the most warlike but because they were the least warlike of neighboring peoples. Roman wars of the earlier period were fought to secure the peace and safety of Rome. To this end Rome continually extended the area of Roman dominion. That she might not have constantly to fight the Latin cities nearest her, she fought those cities once for all, conquered them and incorporated them. Fear of the Cisalpine Gaul compelled

her to extend her boundaries to the Arno and the Po. For her greater security she made the whole of Cisalpine Gaul a province of the Republic. When Carthage threatened her integrity Rome sent her legions into Hispania and reduced that peninsula to obedience. To put an end forever to the aggressions of Carthage, Scipio carried the war into Africa and made Carthage a Roman city. To secure the safety of Rome, Cæsar crossed the Alps and in the course of a Seven Years War so Latinized the regions of Gaul beyond the Alps that they have remained Latin to this day. This impetus of conquest carried Pompey and Lucullus and others to the East and brought the whole region of Greece, Syria and Egypt into the peace of Rome. And it was peace. After these wars of conquest were ended there was no more war between Rome and Carthage; no war between Rome and Antioch. The whole Middle Sea from Jaffa to the Pillars of Hercules washed the shores of a world at peace. The triumph of Octavianus at Actium gave into the hands of one man the keeping of the peace of the world and Octavianus was a man of peace, who in his long reign consolidated the empire and gave peace to all the peoples. For the first time in history the doors of the Temple of Janus were closed and Augustus Cæsar was hailed by his generation as a Prince of Peace.

And this which Augustus did has been attempted over and over again by the rulers of Europe. The war which is now wasting the world is a war for peace. Germany is seeking world domination that she may give to the world a German peace. Four-fifths of the world are fighting Germany that they may save the world from the calamity of that German peace.

## V.

### Peace by Conquest the Peace of Death

THE world of mankind has learned by sad experience that peace by conquest is the peace of death. The completeness of the Roman conquest is seen in the decline and fall of the Roman Empire. Gibbon begins the history of that decline and fall with the reign of Augustus. Rome romanized the Western world. The law and the language of Rome became the law and the language of the Greek, the Syrian, the African and the Britain. These various peoples might use their own language for domestic and literary purposes, but in the Court and the Market they must use the language of Rome. Roman genius was an organizing not a creative genius. Roman culture was the culture of the forum, it dealt not with principles but with practice. Under its presiding power art, science, learning, crystallized, and that world became as perfect as a crystal and as dead as a crystal. The Roman doctrine of uniformity arrests evolution, progress is made not by likeness but by difference. A strong centralized government is the deadly foe of all free thought and free action. To such government every thinking man is dangerous and the inevitable consequence is either the destruction of that government or the decay and death of the human soul. Individuality and solidarity must be reconciled in the interests of life. The Indian tribes emphasized individuality at the expense of solidarity and perished. Rome emphasized solidarity at the expense of individuality and perished. The completeness of the Roman conquest was the measure of its deadly power. There was no longer a stir of life to be felt in Greek, Egyptian, Gaul or Britain; they had all become Roman and as Romans they thought and did as Romans. All variety and initiative perished from the world.



But this was a lesser evil of the conquest. The political machine in the process of conquest had generated a power that enabled it to crush the liberties not only of the provinces, but the liberties of Rome itself. Under the empire Rome was the chief victim of Imperialism; the Senate was shorn of its powers, the citizenship of Rome was merged with the common subjection of the world. The Emperor was the source of all law; the life of every man was subject to his will. The presence of the early Emperors in Rome made the Romans the chief victims of his tyranny. During the reigns of Tiberius, Caius, Claudius and Nero, the ancient families of Rome perished. To be distinguished for birth or riches was fatal. And when Constantine removed the seat of government from Rome to Bizantium then Rome became as the least of the provinces, proving that conquest is more fatal to the conqueror than to the conquered.

Conquest less complete than that of Rome is an un-mixed evil. Eastern Europe has for centuries been in turmoil as half-conquered nationalities writhe and squirm under a hated foreign yoke. There can be no peace in Eastern Europe until these nationalities are utterly crushed or are given local freedom to live their own life in their own way. Austrian and Turkish domination must either become complete or pass away. Neither Austria nor Turkey can crush these subject peoples and hence they must loose them and let them go.

If Germany is successful then we shall have a repetition of Turkey and Austria on a larger scale. Vast discontented populations will keep the world in agitation until Germany crushes the world into a dead uniformity or the world destroys Imperial Germany. There is no middle course; it is either Imperial Germany and a dead world, or a living world and a dead Imperial Germany.

## VI.

### **A League to Enforce Peace**

FROM time to time distracted neighbors have sought to restrict if not the area yet the period of war by entering into leagues to permit war only at the convenience of the leaguers. The right to make war is inherent in the autonomy and sovereignty of the State. Every State must assert its own integrity and defend its own honor. National integrity and honor we are told cannot be arbitrated and as every State is more jealous of these than a woman of her virtue we have occasion for war whenever a State wishes occasion. It is as with the Montagues and Capulets in Verona. Retainers have but to bite the thumb at one another in the streets and swords are out and Gratiano slain, and the sweet loves of Romeo and Juliet brought to a tragic end.

To save the world in a measure from such calamity your League for peace plays the part of the Duke and forbids the brawl. Such Leagues have always failed because the leaguers are themselves the brawlers. They keep the peace just so long as they themselves do not wish to fight. When they think their honor insulted, their integrity threatened, then this League dissolves and war goes on again as if such League had never been.

The most famous of such leagues for peace was the Amphictionic League of the Greek States, by means of which the Greek statesmen sought to mitigate the evils of war between those States. No one as yet dreamed of denying the right of the State to make war; the League sought only to regulate that right so as to prevent the complete destruction of Hellenic civilization. As a matter of fact the League was used by the stronger States to hold the weaker States in subjection and when these stronger States were freed from all fear of the weaker States, then Athens and Sparta fought each other for

the leadership of the Hellenic world and as a consequence of that fight put an end to Hellenic freedom. Exhausted Hellas fell an easy prey to Macedonian imperialism.

Leagues for peace were made again and again by the cities of Italy during the Middle Ages only to be dissolved when the interest of any city demanded it. The States of Holland failed to secure the full fruits of their wonderful victory over Spain because they were a league of States and not a union of peoples. For the same reason these United States, after the war of the revolution, as we shall see, were drifting into anarchy. A league of peace is a rope of sand, that falls to pieces in the handling. The nations today cannot be bound to keep the peace by any such feeble device.

---

## VII.

**Peace  
by  
Diplomacy**

IN EUROPE since the fall of the Roman Empire and the emergence of the modern State every peace between the States has been a diplomatic peace. When in the course of a war one State wins a military victory over another, or when both the parties are exhausted and wish to bring the war to a close, then each State sends its diplomatic representative to a peace conference and these diplomats by a process of chaffering make a treaty of peace. If one of the parties is badly beaten in the war it must accept the terms of the victor; it must cede portions of its territory; pay, it may be, a war indemnity and so, shorn and impoverished, take up again its national life.

If, however, the war is a draw, then each party seeks to gain advantage of the other. It is "give me this and I'll give you that." In these parleys the government,

the property and lives of people are traded as cattle are traded in the market. Cities with their inhabitants are handed over from one government to another with not so much as an "if you please" to the people themselves. In fact it may be said that up to the present time, peoples have no rights that governments are bound to respect. There has not been a peace made in Europe and alas, hardly a peace made in America which has not been an outrage upon the rights of the people concerned. At the treaty of Paris of 1898 the United States government bought from Spain what Spain had no right to sell and took over the title to the government, the freedom, the lives of the people of the Philippine Islands, and when the Philipinos objected to this transfer the United States silenced all such objection by force of arms and such has been the attitude of governments to peoples everywhere and always. But let this be as it may; when your peace parley is over you have your treaty of peace.

And what is a treaty of peace? It is a contract voidable at the will, wish or whim of either party. It is a scrap of paper to be torn up when it is to the supposed interest of either party to tear it. When the German Chancellor said of the treaty of 1838 guaranteeing the neutrality of Belgium that it was "a scrap of paper," all Europe and America held up their hands in holy horror. And yet Von Benthman Hollweg only gave cynical expression to a self-evident diplomatic truth. If treaties of peace were binding then wars in Europe would have ceased long ago. Peace by diplomacy is never a peace; it is only a truce. Either party does not hesitate to violate it at convenience. When our President wanted to build a canal through the territory of the United States of Colombia he did not let so little a thing as treaty rights stand in his way. By fomenting a revolution, he voided the treaty, took from the United States of Colombia their richest province and built the Canal. When the United States Congress at the instance of shipping inter-



ests exempted American coastwise vessels from canal tolls they made of the Hays-Pauncefote treaty a scrap of paper. And what of it—is not such the nature of treaties?

Peace by treaty, I say, is not a peace at all; it is only a truce to be ended at the instance of either party. When a party to a treaty wishes to get rid of a treaty it declares war and that is the end of the treaty. If the present war ends in nothing more than a treaty of peace, it will end in a calamity greater than the calamity of the war itself. After the signing of such a treaty the nations will have to go back home and give themselves to a feverish, exhausting preparation for the next war.

---

## VIII.

**The Sovereignty  
of the State Must  
Give Place to  
the Sovereignty  
of the People**

AND there be those who look forward to such a consummation not with resignation as to a necessary evil but with joyful satisfaction. These men, with a blindness born of profound ignorance of history, affirm that war is a necessity of progress. It seems to me that the history of the American aborigines is sufficient argument against this fallacy. If war and progress are cause and effect then the American Indian ought to have outstripped the European in social development by a whole millennium. If war is necessary to progress then we should at once dissolve the union of the United States and leave each State autonomous and sovereign to carry on war with every other State. But if, as Sherman said, war is hell, then the less we have of it the better, unless, as extreme Calvinists, we believe the enlargement of hell to better the greater glory of God.

The union of the States of America, under a federal

government after the Revolution was brought about to put an end to conditions which the extreme militarist considers necessary to human advancement. The Federal Government was formed to restrict the area of war and enlarge the area of peace. By reason of the Federal Government the sovereignty of each State was subjected to the control of the people of all the States to secure the peace of the people.

The adoption of the Constitution of the United States marked as great an advance in political evolution as the advance from the tribal to the family organization and from the family to the form of the City State. It marks a new era in political progress and is well worthy of study as showing how the forces of evolution work.

At the close of the Revolutionary War each of the thirteen States was autonomous and sovereign. They were of different origin and had developed in diverse environments. The Northernmost tier of States known as New England had been settled and organized by middle class Englishmen. The motive of this settlement was religious. These men and women left their country, their kindred and their fathers' house that they might in some new land make for themselves a country in which they could worship God in the way of their own choosing. These Puritans established a theocracy and tried to make the will of God the law of the State. The Middle Colonies of New York and New Jersey were settled by Dutch and Swedes and the motive of this settlement was commercial. New Amsterdam was a trading post for the merchants of Amsterdam proper. Pennsylvania was settled by Penn in the interest of freedom of conscience and a peaceful life. Maryland was a refuge for persecuted Roman Catholics. The Southern Colonies were occupied by the younger sons of the English gentry who established there great landed estates worked by slave labor.

The only common interests of these colonies lay in their English descent and their allegiance to the English

crown. The conquest of New Amsterdam and New Jersey unified these Colonies with the others under the English Crown. Each of these thirteen colonies was organized as a political unit. Each had its own governor appointed by the Crown, its own legislature elected by the people and its own judiciary.

When the encroachment of the English King and Parliament threatened these colonists with the loss of their rights as English freemen, they took common counsel against this common danger. A Committee of Correspondence between the Colonies was formed to secure as far as possible unified action against this growing aggression. As the crisis became acute this Committee of Correspondence merged into a Congress. Each of the States sent representatives to this Congress to consult concerning the general safety. At the outbreak of hostilities this Congress assumed the direction of the war; it appointed a general-in-chief and so brought the various armies of the resisting Colonies under a single command. In due time this Congress declared the independence of the Colonies from the English Crown and the United States of America took its place in the national life of the world.

During all these momentous events the Congress acted upon its own initiative. It had no clearly defined powers, its relation to the various States was inchoate, it was a mere advisory body, lacking in all the essentials of a sovereign State. It had no direct jurisdiction over any person, it had no power of taxation, no judiciary to interpret its laws and no executive to enforce them. The appointment of Washington as General-in-Chief was without legal warrant; it was an usurpation justified by military necessity. A body so constituted could not be effective and the history of the Revolutionary War is the story of that inefficiency. This war dragged on for eight years and in the end was not won by the Americans but lost by the British. Had North been able to carry

on the war against the Colonies with half the energy that Pitt displayed in the war against the French in Canada, the revolting Colonies would have been crushed in a year. But when such men as Pitt, then Earl of Chatham, and Burke and Fox and Rockingham opposed the war in the English Parliament, the King and North and Grenville were more helpless than the Continental Congress and the war was lost by a default.

At the close of the war the Union of the States for the purposes of the war was in process of dissolution. The Continental Congress had fallen into such disrepute that its members had ceased to attend its sessions. The Continental certificates of indebtedness were without value, so that the saying "not worth a continental" passed into a proverb. The natural antagonism between autonomous and sovereign States was becoming acute and war between the States imminent. At best these little political units were being isolated to become the easy prey of any European power that wished to pick them up.

This growing disunion alarmed American statesmen and everyone saw the necessity of a strong, central government if the fruits of the Revolution were not to be lost and the last state of the American people worse than the first. But how to constitute such a government was beyond the wisdom of the professional politicians. How the States were to be unified and yet remain States was a problem to the solution of which the professional mind was unequal. To crush the States into one solidified, centralized nation was out of the question; that meant civil war. To have the States in every respect autonomous and sovereign was equally disastrous to the peace of the people, for that meant inter-State war. To many there seemed no way out but in a return to the English obedience. And then something happened; something of vast importance to the political evolution of mankind. A Philadelphia merchant, Palatiah Webster by name, wrote and published a pamphlet.

## IX.

### **The Unique Character of the American Constitution**

IN THIS pamphlet Webster gave to his distracted countrymen a discovery in political science, and like all discoveries it was simply opening the eyes of men to facts which had always been there for the open eye to see. Webster called attention to the fact that every man stands in two relations in life, and these relations give rise to two classes of rights, which may be called civil and political rights. His civil rights, such as rights of person, property and testament are under the protection of the civil State. This State has for such protection criminal and civil law; by these laws it protects a man's person against violence, his property against robbery and escheatment, and his reputation against defamation. Its laws prescribe the terms of ownership and testament.

In addition to these civil rights a man has rights which are political, such as the right to defense against the aggression of foreign states, the right to travel beyond the confines of his own State, the right to engage in inter-State commerce, and he looks to the State for the maintenance of his political as well as his civil rights.

Now Webster's discovery was that this duty of the protection of rights could be separated, the protection of civil rights to be in the keeping of one political organization and the protection of political rights in the keeping of another. His proposition was that the various States maintaining their organization for civil purposes should abandon their autonomy and cede their sovereignty, so far as political rights were concerned. For all political purposes, such as defense from foreign aggression, foreign and inter-State commerce, the uttering of coinage and the establishment of post roads, the people of the States should establish a central government, endowed with all

governmental powers; with the power of direct jurisdiction over persons, the power of direct taxation, with its own bicameral legislature, with its own executive and its own judiciary, and such powers of the central government should be restricted to the confirmation and enlargement of political rights, and to the various States reserved the care of civil rights. The word political is here used technically and not in its popular sense.

In speaking of this letter of Webster's, Hannis Taylor says in a letter to "The Nation" of Jan. 18, 1912: "Men had always known that a single State such as England or Virginia had a bicameral legislature, an executive and a judiciary and direct jurisdiction and taxation, but that a Federal Government could have a bicameral legislature, an executive and judiciary, that such a government could be clothed with direct jurisdiction over persons and the power of direct taxation, this was a new discovery in political science and its application to practice in the Constitution of the United States a revolution in political organization." States autonomous and sovereign in civil affairs, while subject to central control, in political matters were unknown before the adoption of the Constitution of the United States; a Government with direct jurisdiction, with power of taxation, with legislature, executive and judiciary, having in its keeping only political rights, was equally unknown before that time.

The full import of this departure in political organization was not fully appreciated by those who inaugurated it; it is hardly appreciated yet. It was then and is still thought of as a union of States, whereas it is a union of peoples; it was not the States but the people who were unified under the Federal Government. Each American is subject to two distinct jurisdictions; if he commits a murder he is tried in the courts of his State, if he utters a counterfeit coin he is tried in the courts of the United States. For the protection of his civil rights he pays taxes into the treasury of his State; for the protection

of his political rights he pays taxes directly into the treasury of the United States.

It took a long time for the full significance of that change to penetrate into the consciousness of the politician and statesman to say nothing of the common people. In the earlier period whenever a trifling grievance was experienced by the people of a State those people threatened the withdrawal of their State from the Union. But the Federal Government had even then so manifested its usefulness that such threat ceased with the passing grievance. Only once has the existence of the Federal Government been seriously challenged. The Civil War of 1861-5 was the consequence of such challenge. The outcome of that war was the establishment of the Federal Government upon an immoveable foundation as a government not of delegated but of original jurisdiction.

The blessings of this government are now so manifest as to win the willing allegiance of all its citizens and the admiration of the stranger. Millions have come from every region of the earth to live under this government and enjoy its benefits. It has restricted the area of war and enlarged the area of peace over a territory as great as that of all Europe and over more than a hundred million people. The population of forty-eight States, sovereign as to civil rights, enjoy the political right of free and unrestricted inter-State commerce. There is not a custom house from the Atlantic to the Pacific ocean nor from the Great Lakes to the Gulf. The interior State is not shut out from the sea, for the port of any State is the port of every State. The small State has equal political rights with the larger States and finds its peace and safety in its union with these larger units.

To say that the government of the United States and the government of the several States have yet much to do in adjusting these governments to the needs of the people is only to say that governments are progressive. The discontent for instance of the Industrial Workers



of the World is not with the forms of these governments but with the social and industrial structures which these governments for the time being protect. In the case of these governments, political evolution has outstripped social and industrial evolution. We have social aristocracy and industrial autocracy in a free State. But this anomaly is rapidly passing away and it is the political principle of democracy that will soon transform our society and our industry.

---

## X.

### **The Federation of the World the Next Step in Political Progress**

THIS brief study of the origin, nature and growth of the constitution of the government of the people of the United States is timely because in the judgment of many it indicates the way, the only way, in which peace can be established in the earth. The political problem now demanding solution is the same problem that confronted the framers of the American Constitution and the framers of that Constitution guided by the political genius of Palatiah Webster, solved that problem. By the device of different political organizations to administer civil and strictly political law they made possible not only the permanent pacification of the States of North America, but of the States of the world. The principles of the Constitution that govern the Union of the people of the American States can be adapted without change to the government of a union of all the people of the world. All that is necessary is that the people of the world shall feel the necessity of such union and desire it and that organized governments shall not ignore this necessity nor crush this desire.

That the time is favorable to such organization of the

world is evident; there is no other way out of the present crisis except the way of tyranny or anarchy. A league for peace or a treaty of peace will at this time be not progressive but retrogressive; instead of restricting the area of war and enlarging the area of peace such devices will make war continuous and universal. All the energies of the world will be exhausted in armaments. The mass of the people will be condemned to live in the direst poverty, and retrogression will carry the race backward through barbarism into a savagery more degrading than that from which mankind has so slowly and painfully emerged. Already our civilization is breaking under the strain that has been put upon it, if that strain is continued indefinitely the ruin of the race will surely follow.

Confronted by such dire calamity the people of the world must be roused to take thought for the peace of the world. And the only way to secure a permanent peace for the world is by a union of the people of the world. When Edith Cavell was led out to execution and stood waiting the fire of the firing squad it is said she cried, "Patriotism is not enough!" And the cry of this martyr is finding echo in every human heart. In the present stage of social evolution it is fatal for a man to think only of himself; in the present stage of political evolution it is fatal for a State or Nation to think only of itself. As sheep are compelled to flock together in a storm so the Nations and States of the world are today compelled to stand together as a defense against such a tempest as has never before threatened the wreck of human society.

The proposed federation of the world will only make permanent a union of the peoples of the various nations which this dire necessity has already brought about. Four-fifths of the world is at this moment united in a common purpose to secure the freedom and the peace of the world. It is a small matter to devise the means whereby this union may be made permanent.

Social and industrial changes which have occurred during the last century and a half are such as to compel this federation of the world. We are no longer strangers and foreigners to one another, that we should hate one another but neighbors and friends who should love one another. By means of the aeroplane, the railway and the telegraph we are next door neighbors to London and within visiting distance of Pekin. We hear the gossip of Tokio of yesterday at our breakfast table this morning; we are far more familiar with what is going on in Petrograd than with what is occurring in the next town.

We have developed a world consciousness that makes it impossible to confine our sympathy to the limits of our country. Our country is to us today as our State in the Union. We are loyal to our country but our greater loyalty is to that world of which our country is a member.

---

## XI.

**The World  
Organized  
by Industry  
and Commerce  
and Science**

IN ASKING for the union of the world under a federal government we are only asking that that shall be made explicit which is now implicit. The world is at present organized into a unified whole.

This work of unification has already been accomplished by commerce, industry and science.

Capitalism, like Edith Cavell, cries "Patriotism is not enough;" it seeks investment wherever investment can be most profitably made; it is catholic in its conceptions. The merchant vies with the capitalist in making patriotism subordinate to profit; he seeks his market in every land. So inter-dependent have the peoples of the world become commercially that isolation today means starvation. And if the world can be made one commercially it can as easily be made one politically.

And today industry is international not only because the products of the industry of one country are exchanged for the industrial products of another, but more because the class consciousness of the working man is indifferent to national boundaries. It is a principle of working class doctrine that the interest of the working class is the same in all countries and under all forms of government. This consciousness is not yet powerful enough to control the action of the industrial classes, but it is a growing influence in favor of international organization. The address of the Labor Party of England to the Workers of the World is one of the most important political documents in the present crisis. It foreshadows a time when the world's peace will lie in the keeping of the industrial workers of the world. It was in the power of the working class of Germany to have prevented this world war. The bitter consequences of their failure is a lesson that will not be lost. The German Socialists were betrayed by their political leaders and by their own Germanic pride and prejudice. But while that has arrested the progress of international industrialism, it has only arrested it. The working class of all countries will see its interest not in international war, but in international peace and will be potent in promoting international republicanism.

The development of science has gone along with commerce and industry in promoting the unity of the world. The results of science cannot be confined within any country. What is whispered in the ear is shouted from the housetop. A discovery made in one country becomes instantly the common property of all countries. It is sheer absurdity for the various nations to try today to keep scientific secrets for war purposes. Just as soon as any use is made of that secret it is an open secret. Science is making war impossible because it is making war so frightfully costly in life and treasure. Unification of knowledge which is a consequence of the scientific method must bring about, in due time, political unity. If things

go on as they are going and science becomes the mere bond slave of nationalistic war, then science will at last, in destroying all that is worthy in human life, destroy itself. As knowledge perished with the fall of the Roman Empire, so will science fail with the downfall of the present order.

---

## XII.

**The Healing  
of the  
Schism  
in  
The English Race**

THE healing of the schism between the English speaking peoples is one of the consequences of the present war that brings world federation within the realm of practical politics. To the political genius of this race the world owes that form of government which best reconciles individuality with solidarity; freedom with order. Representative government, the rule of the center by the circumference, is the contribution of the English to the political practice of the world. This form of organization secures local autonomy in matters local and promotes the unity of localities in a more general political organization. Because of this flexibility of their political organization, the development of English political life has been mainly evolutionary. Its revolutions have preserved not destroyed its political and social structure.

The schism in this liberalizing people caused by the American Revolution, which has separated the English into two antagonistic political units has now been healed. The English race is now one people, making common cause in maintaining the principle of responsible government in the world and so clearing the way for the federation of the world. If the American and English people and all the Colonies federate as they will and must, then the federation of the world will follow as a political necessity.

### XIII.

#### Decreasing Causes of War

EVERY advance in the evolution of social order and political organization brings about a decrease in the causes of war and so promotes unity of interest. Prior to the evolution of the tribe every man was of necessity a warrior. Each man was then autonomous and sovereign and was the natural enemy of every other man. Armed with his club he was always ready for the fray. As long as he could fight he could live; he had to be watchful by day, he had to hide himself in the night if he would escape from prowling men and prowling beasts. It was in this early period that the fighting instinct had its origin. This instinct is today a survival. The protection of a man's life is no longer in the keeping of the individual; it is a social affair. The police are set to watch over the safety of the people and so effectually do they perform this duty that not one man in a million has ever occasion to fight in his own behalf.

In the barbaric ages war was a pastime. The Iroquois Indian hunted men with the same zest that an Englishman hunts big game. Our Teutonic ancestors looked on war as a sport and spent their time in fighting, eating and getting drunk. After the battle their God Woden made wassail and drank the blood of the slain from the skulls of the slain. And we modern Teutons are the children of our fathers. We love to fight for the love of fighting. There are still those among us who like Richard in the play, "in weak piping times of peace have no delight to pass away the time." The Mediæval Knight rode out with helmet and spear seeking war for the fun of fighting.

But the methods of modern warfare have put an end to all the pleasures of war. War is today a foul, tedious, loathsome business. Trench warfare has made war a task hateful to decent men. There are coming out of

these trenches millions of men loathing war with a deadly loathing and these men will insist that such wars shall never be again.

War in well organized States is, for the most part, a business. The nation goes to war as a highwayman takes to the road. The nation is out for loot. It covets the fields, the houses of its neighbors and it goes out to take them. War is always a business with the military class; from war this class gains honor and riches. Cæsar, when he went as Questor to Spain, had to borrow five million sesterces from Crassus to pay his debts; in two years, by looting his Province, he paid this debt and became a rich man. Lucullus, next to Cæsar in military genius, fought two wonderful campaigns in the East and then, with the spoils of war, came home to gain immortality not for the brilliancy of his campaigns but for the excellence of his dinners. War justifies robbery as it justifies killing.

The present war was undertaken for the purpose of levying immense war indemnities for the enrichment of Germany. The present insistence upon the principle of no annexations and no indemnities is a protest against this making war a business. And this war must be fought to a finish to make such business forever impossible.

In times past religion has been the frightful cause of war. The Gods of the nations have always been jealous and quarrelsome. The quarrel between Islam and Christendom exhausted the energies of Europe for two centuries. The religious wars of the fifteenth and sixteenth centuries are among the most frightful in history. From the League of Schmalkald in 1528 to the Peace of Westphalia in 1648 all Western Europe was a slaughter-pen. Germany was desolated. The Low countries had to save themselves from the fury of Alva by opening their dykes and drowning their lands. The flower of France perished in battles and massacres. The life of Spain was crushed out by the Inquisition of Torquemada and when these



wars ceased from exhaustion, the people of Europe said "never again" and religious wars passed away forever.

Europe has been wasted by dynastic wars. The war of the Spanish Succession impoverished Austria and France and ruined Spain. Men died by the thousand and property by the millions was destroyed to decide whether a Hapsburg or a Bourbon should sit on the throne of Spain. The present war is in part dynastic. Millions of human beings are dying; billions of accumulated wealth are perishing to decide whether the House of Hohenzollern is to rule Middle Europe from Berlin to Bagdad from the throne of Imperial Germany and have in its keeping the peace of the world. This war can never cease until that question is decided in the negative once and for all. When this war is over the peace of the world must be in the keeping of the world.

It has been said that the cause of this war is the Straights of Dover. Germany has but two indifferent seaports, Bremen and Cuxhaven. Her object in the war was to seize Northern France and make Calais, Cherbourg and Brest harbors of Germany. The war is a war for markets. Such wars have afflicted mankind from the beginnings of commerce. The only way to bring such wars to an end is to organize the world politically as the United States is organized and to make the port of any country the port of every country and to establish free and unrestricted international commerce as the law of mankind. No selfish interest must be allowed to stand in the way.

Remove all barriers from commerce and commerce will of itself unify and pacify the world.

## XIV.

### **The Rise of the Working Class and the Emancipation of Women**

WITHIN the past century two events have occurred in the political world which will have a powerful and pacific influence for all time to come. These events are the rise of the working class and the emancipation of women. These two elements will be controlling in shaping political policy and these elements are pacific. The working class and the women have borne the burden of war and have enjoyed none of its privileges. The women have produced all the raw material of war. Their motherhood is the only source of supply of man power and without man power there can be no war. Until now women have had no voice in affairs of State. Wars are made without regard to them. But that time is past. From henceforth the women must be consulted in all the great affairs of State and the vote of women will be for peace.

Until now the working class has been the fighting tool of the ruling class. It is the man power and the labor power that makes up and supplies the armies and it has had nothing to say as to what shall be done with its life or with the product of its labor. But from now on the working class will hold the balance of political power and it will refuse to give its life and the product of its labor to further the selfish schemes of the military and commercial classes. From now on every war must justify itself to the women and the workers.

## XV.

### **The Power of the Interdict**

IF THE countries now prosecuting in common the war against Imperial Germany were to federate, as they must if that war is not to end in irremediable disaster, they would at once become possessed of a power for the pacification of the world that would be invincible. Upon all nations refusing the blessings of federation they would lay an interdict and proclaim non-intercourse with such nations. This war could be ended tomorrow if the allied nations were federated nations. Such federation guaranteeing local and responsible government to all people within the federation and establishing open ports together with free and unrestricted commerce between the peoples of the federation, could say to recalcitrant nations: "Come in or stay out. If you come in you will have the guarantee of responsible government and the freedom of the ports and the seas, but if you stay out you stay out. Your ships cannot enter a port of the federation nor your people trade with the people of the federation." If this federation was now in existence and an ultimatum given to the German people that they must within the next six months make their government responsible to the people and join on equal terms this federation of the world on pain of Interdict that would for the next twenty-five years shut against them every port and intercourse with every people of this federated world, the German people, if they did not dethrone their emperor, would shear him of his power and establish in his place a responsible government, permitting the German people to join the other peoples of the world in establishing a world in which the reign of law shall take the place of the reign of might and the peace of the world shall be in the keeping of the people of the world.

## XVI.

### **American Leadership**

IN THIS work of federation the leadership falls to the people of the United States. They have worked out this theory of federation in practice and have proved its usefulness. Forty-eight distinct civil sovereignties are federated for political purposes, and these civil sovereignties find their glory, their peace and their safety in this federation. Upon the people of the United States now rests the hope of the world for deliverance from the threatened domination of German Imperialism. With unselfish purpose, with no thought of territorial aggrandizement, nor hope of enrichment from war indemnity, the people of the United States have placed their life and treasure at the disposal of their President that he may wage this war to make the world safe for democracy. Not that he may make the world safe for the nations, but safe for the people. From this time on governments must be for the people, not peoples for the governments.

In their President the people have found not only a Statesman but a seer. With far vision he looks onward to the end and sees that the end of this war must be the end of war. His public utterances have been prophetic. Every act of his has had in view not the immediate present but the immediate future. He did not enter this war in any heat of anger. He was not hurried by insults to national honor. With a patience that has tried the patience of his own people he has bided his time. And when he entered the war he did not enter it to serve the selfish aims of his own much less the selfish aims of any other country but that he might serve the peace and safety of the world.

In all his addresses the President has looked forward to some kind of world organization as the outcome of

the war. In his address to the Senate in January 1917, in his war message of April last, in his letter to the Pope, in his last statement of war aims the President rises to sublime heights of unselfish statesmanship. He offers a peace of equity to all the world on condition that that peace shall be secured for all time by such organization of the world as shall make forever impossible such wanton outrage of peace as has brought the world to the verge of ruin. Again in history the man and the occasion have met and Woodrow Wilson will be the guiding spirit in bringing to pass that federation of the world which I am convinced he has had in mind from the first as the only possible outcome of the present crisis.

---

## XVII.

### **The Mode of Securing Federation**

IN ORDER to secure peace by federation appeal must be made to the peoples of the world to send representatives to a congress that shall form a constitution for world government. This appeal should not be for the assembly of a peace Congress but for a Constitutional Convention. Such convention can assemble only if the nations now arrayed against Germany have at heart the permanent pacification of the world. If these nations are still determined to be autonomous and sovereign in all matters political, if they still indulge in imperialistic dreams, then this war will end in a diplomatic peace which will be precursor of a war still more frightful in the immediate future. But if these nations, following the example of the States of North America, shall be willing in the interest of the common good to permit their various peoples to elect representatives to a world constitutional convention, which shall constitute a govern-

ment with direct jurisdiction in world politics, with the power of direct taxation over every person in the world, having as its duty to create an army and a navy to maintain the world's peace, having the right to regulate international commerce and international currency; this government to have a bicameral legislature, with its Senate in which all nations great and small shall have equal representation; with its house of representatives in which the people shall have representation in proportion to population; with a world President with a ministry directly responsible to the legislature and with a judiciary to interpret and enforce the laws of this government—I say that if the various nationalities whose autonomy and sovereignty is now threatened by the German aggression shall be willing of their own accord, or shall be forced to willingness by the eager willingness of their people, to form such an international governmental trust, then this war will be the greatest blessing the world has ever known.

This call should come from men and women who have the ear of world opinion. Nor should it wait on the close of the war for utterance. A congress of a federated world can alone make lasting peace for the world.

If the world is not yet ready for so great a blessing, then it only remains for those who see the future to do what Palatiah Webster did; cast the seed of truth out upon the world to find lodgement where it may, in the full assurance that it will bring forth its fruit in due season.

## NOTE.

---

### PALATIAH WEBSTER.

My attention was called to the work of Palatiah Webster by a letter of Hannis Taylor in "The Nation" of January 18, 1912, in which he defended the position taken in his book, "The Origin and Growth of the American Constitution" (Houghton, Mifflin, 1911) in which he gives Webster the credit of being the author or rather the discoverer of the principles that underlie the Federal Constitution. Taylor discusses this question at large in his book (pages 19-27) and proves beyond question that Palatiah Webster, in a pamphlet issued in Philadelphia in 1783, outlined the plan of a Federal Government with jurisdiction over persons, with power of taxation, with a bicameral legislature, an executive and a judiciary, which was the basis of the resolutions outlining a form of government which were submitted by James Madison to the Constitutional Convention and were known as the Virginia plan; it was also the basis of the constitution worked out in detail by Charles Pinckney of South Carolina, and the Pinckney document was used as printer's copy. Webster was likewise the source from which Hamilton derived his plan, so that the Madison-Pinckney-Hamilton plan which was adopted by the Convention was in reality the Webster plan.

This contention of Hannis Taylor commended itself to me as the explanation of an historical puzzle. I knew that the plan of Hamilton was only a variation of the plan of Madison. The Pinckney plan, which was really the printer's copy for the Constitution, was given no

credit by the historians of the Constitution and I naturally supposed it to be of no importance. The authorship of the Constitution then rested with Madison and the puzzle to me was how a mind so commonplace as that of Madison could have conceived a plan so daringly original as the plan of the Federal Constitution. Until I read Taylor's letter I gave Madison the honor due to so great an innovation. After reading that letter, Madison fell back into his commonplaceness and I gave honor where honor was due. Taylor prints Webster's pamphlet in full, in the appendix to his book.

The division between civil and political rights is implicit rather than explicit in Webster's document. I have made that division to bring out more clearly the nature of the Federal Government.

Palatiah Webster was born in Lebanon, Connecticut, in 1726. He graduated from Yale College in 1746. In 1755 he removed to Philadelphia where he became a prosperous merchant. He was the author of many pamphlets on finance.



940.92

C858

Crapsey, A. S.

Internat. republicanism in

882.1  
50 Mar 26K

940.92

C858

